



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,633	10/17/2003	Hubin Jiang	11061	2594

7590 10/30/2007
Charles B. Lobsenz
Roberts, Mlotkowski & Hobbes, PC
Suite 850
8270 Greensboro Drive
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

WILSER, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,633

Applicant(s)

JIANG ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Wilser

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/5/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the original filing of October 17, 2003. Claims 1-19 are pending and have been considered below.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 160 in Figure 1, 180 in Figure 1, 190 in Figure 1, 230 in Figure 2, 260 in Figure 2, 270 in Figure 2, 280 in Figure 2, 210 in Figure 2, 320 in Figure 2, 350 in Figure 2, 360 in Figure 2, 740 in Figure 7, 815 in Figure 8, 830 in Figure 8, 835 in Figure 8, 840 in Figure 8, and 880 in Figure 8. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading difficult. New application papers with lines 1½ or double spaced on good quality paper are required. Pages 15 and 16 of the specification are not double-spaced and should be resubmitted in such format as described above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-8 and 10-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lebda et al. (US 6,385,594).

Claim 1: Lebda discloses a system for coordinating tasks comprising:

- a. at least one mission coordinator (loan processing computer) (column 3, lines 30-32);
- b. at least one service node in communication with mission coordinator (column 3, lines 33-34); and
- c. mission coordinator executes missions by creating a mission instance comprising a task instance in which the task instance includes at least one task step to be executed by the service node (Figure 1).

Claim 2: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 1 above, and further discloses that the mission comprises at least one casual task, trigger rule, and resultant task and that the results from the casual tasks are generated as inputs to the trigger rule to generate a resultant task (column 3, lines 14-18).

Claim 3: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 2 above, and further discloses that multiple casual tasks are executed simultaneously and the system waits until the trigger rule is satisfied prior to triggering a resultant task instance (column 3, lines 20-22).

Claim 4: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 2 above, and further discloses that the casual task is a root task for initiating execution of the mission (column 3, lines 6-9).

Claim 5: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 3 above, and further discloses that the casual task is executed at a remote service node (column 4, lines 32-36).

Claim 6: Lebda discloses a system for coordinating tasks comprising:

- a. at least one mission coordinator (loan processing computer) (column 3, lines 30-32);

- b. at least one service node in communication with mission coordinator (column 3, lines 33-34); and

c. missions comprise a plurality of tasks generated by the mission coordinator and each task is defined by a task instance and communicated to the service node for execution (column 5, lines 25-33).

Claim 7: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 6 above, and further discloses that the task instance comprises input information storage designating the location of input data needed for execution of the task instance (column 4, lines 10-19).

Claim 8: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 6 above, and further discloses that the task instance comprises a processing engine that permits the tasks to be executed by the service node (column 3, lines 30-37).

Claim 10: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 6 above, and further discloses that at least one service node is a remote service node (column 3, lines 52-58).

Claim 11: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 6 above, and further discloses that the task instance comprises a resultant container (database) for storing results associated with execution of task instance (column 3, lines 10-11).

Claim 12: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 11 above, and further discloses that the service node is a remote service node and that results are communicated back to the mission coordinator (column 4, lines 32-36).

Claim 13: Lebda discloses a method for coordinating tasks in a networked computing environment comprising the steps of:

- a. selecting a mission (column 2, lines 1-6);
- b. creating a mission instance comprising at least one task (Figure 1);
- c. generating at least one task instance associated with at least one task (column 5, lines 25-33);
- d. transmitting task instance to a service node (column 5, lines 43-46);
- e. executing task instance on the service node (column 5, lines 49-59);
- f. receiving the results of the execution of the task instance (column 5, lines 59-67); and
- g. applying rules-based analysis to determine whether and when additional task instances should be created based on the results (column 5, lines 5-10).

Claim 14: Lebda discloses a method as in Claim 13 above, and further discloses that the tasks associated with said mission are predefined (Figure 1).

Claim 15: Lebda discloses a method as in Claim 13 above, and further discloses that the tasks associated with the mission are determined based on input obtained in connection with the selection of the mission (column 4, lines 1-7).

Art Unit: 2195

Claim 16: Lebda disclose a method as in Claim 13 above, and further discloses that each task instance is represented by an instance structure and is executed either on a local or remote service node (column 3, lines 30-37).

Claim 17: Lebda discloses a method as in Claim 13 above, and further discloses that multiple task instance are generated in connection with a single task and are broadcasted to multiple service nodes (column 3, lines 30-34).

Claim 19: Lebda discloses a method as in Claim 16, above and further discloses that the task instance structure comprises input storage indicative of the location of input data necessary for completion of the task associated with the instance (column 4, lines 27-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebda et al. (US 6,385,594) in view of Anderson et al. (US 6,571,246).

Art Unit: 2195

Claim 9: Lebda discloses a system as in Claim 8 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the processing engine comprises executable software code. However, Anderson discloses a similar system in which the processing engine does comprise executable software code (column 4, lines 49-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the processing engine include executable software code in Lebda. One would have been motivated to include executable software code so that the processing engine could execute instructions supplied by the task instances.

Claim 18: Lebda disclose a method as in Claim 16 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the task instance comprises executable code capable of being executed on a service node. However, Anderson discloses a similar method in which the task instance does include executable code capable of being executed on a service node (column 4, lines 49-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the task instances in Lebda comprise executable code. One would have been motivated to have the task instances comprise executable code so the service nodes could carry out the instructions that were asked of it by the task and supply them back to the task instance.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2195


- a. Ward et al. (US 7,146,337) System and method for originating loans.
- b. Peth (US 6,957,192) System and method for automated credit matching.
- c. Lynch et al. (US 6,823,319) System and method for automated process of deal structuring.
- d. Brown et al. (US 6,622,131) Method and system for auctioning loans through a computing system.
- e. Lebda et al. (US 6,611,816) Method and computer network for co-ordinating a loan over the Internet.
- f. Straub (US 2005/0010507) Device and method for financial services contact management.
- g. Lussler (US 2004/0049450) Method and apparatus for coordinating real estate closing services.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Wilser whose telephone number is (571) 270-1689. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5:00 EST (Alt Fridays Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2195

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


MPW
June 12, 2007


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100